

## REMARKS

### Status of the Claims

- Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-20 are pending in the Application after entry of this amendment.
- Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-20 are rejected by the Examiner.
- Claims 1 and 10 are amended by the Applicant.

### Telephone Interview

Applicant thanks the Examiner for granting a telephone interview held on October 18, 2005. During that interview, Applicant explained the differences between the invention and the prior art. The claims were discussed with respect to those differences. Specifically, Applicant noted that the claims recited that the docking station is absent a computer core when the mobile computer is uninstalled. The Examiner explained how the present claims could read on the prior art. Applicant agreed to amend the claims to more clearly define the computing capability differences between the prior art and the claimed invention.

### Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 10-11 and 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for including a phrase that may be considered redundant and having a phrase that lacks antecedent basis.

Applicant has amended Claim 10 to remove the phrase "the at least one external computer for communicating with the mobile docking station". Applicant has also amended Claim 10 to properly claim "a mobile computer". Applicant requests reconsideration of the 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection in light of the amendments.

### Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-15 and 19-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,538,880 to Kamijo et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,778,519 to Goshey et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Kamijo et al. discloses a notebook PC 110, also referred to as a mainframe PC, a mainframe and a PC mainframe (col. 3 line 53 through col. 4 line 14), and an input/output apparatus 120 which may be embodied as a PDA (col. 4 lines 11-14). The PC mainframe 110 is configured to accept the input/output device 120 (Figure 1). The input/output device 120 may operate independently of the PC mainframe 110 or it may be operable if within wireless communication range (col. 3 lines 40-47 and col. 3 lines 61-67).

Goshey et al. discloses a system for transparently sharing peripheral devices over a network. (Abstract). The system includes a first computer having at least one peripheral device, and a second computer that is networked to the first computer. The second computer is configured to send a request to use the at least one peripheral device over the network, and the request is processed to determine whether the second computer has sharing privileges to use the at least one peripheral device. (col. 2, lines 52-59).

Amended Claim 1 recites, in relevant part:

A docking station for a mobile computer, the docking station comprising:

a port...;

a communication interface...; and

a display...;

wherein the docking station is itself mobile, has no computer core when the mobile computer is uninstalled, and enables the communication interface to acquire the information of the external computer and to display the information when the mobile computer is both uninstalled and without communications with the docking station....

Applicant finds support for this amendment at least in paragraph 0025 of the present specification. ("Since the docking station has no computer of its own because the computer bay 212 is empty...").

Applicant submits that Kamijo et al. fails to teach a docking station that has no computer core when the mobile computer is uninstalled but which communicates with an external computer when the mobile computer is both uninstalled and is without communications with the docking station. Specifically, considering the Figures of Kamijo et al. and their supporting text, there is no disclosure in Kumijo et al. that teaches or even suggests that the PC mainframe 110 does not have a computer core when the input/output apparatus 120 is uninstalled. In fact, Kumijo et al. does disclose that the input/output apparatus 120 can use the functions of the mainframe PC 110 by remote control. (col. 4

lines 63-67). Applicant submits that this disclosure strongly suggests that the PC mainframe 110 continues to function as a PC mainframe even when input/output device 120 is uninstalled. This teaching is opposite to the recitation of Claim 1. Applicant thus submits that Kamijo et al. teaches away from amended Claim 1. Applicant has amended independent Claim 10 similarly.

Applicant submits that Goshey et al. also fails to teach or suggest a docking station that has no computer core when the mobile computer is uninstalled but which communicates with an external computer when the mobile computer is both uninstalled and is without communications with the docking station.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness per 35 U.S.C §103(a) (See MPEP 706.02(j)) because all elements are not found in the cited art. Applicants note that neither Kamijo et al. nor Goshey et al. either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the invention recited in amended Claims 1 and 10. Additionally, as discussed above, Kumijo et al. teaches away from the present invention and therefore cannot be rationally combined with Goshey et al. to render obvious the invention recited in amended independent Claims 1 and 10. Applicant submits that amended independent Claims 1 and 10 thus patentably define over the cited art.

Similarly, Claims 2-4 and 6-9 depend on amended independent Claim 1 and likewise patentably define over the cited art. Claims 11- and 13-20 depend on amended independent Claim 10 and thus also patentably define over the cited art. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of all pending claims.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-1973 / 304061.1

**Application No.:** 10/621,286

**Office Action Dated:** 8/31/2005


**PATENT**

**Conclusion**

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112 and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections and request reconsideration because the pending claims patentably define over the cited art.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 30, 2005

  
Jerome G. Schaefer  
Registration No. 50,800

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439